42390P13736   PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12-18, 22, and 23 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16-18, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,651,171 ("England") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,872 ("Okada"). Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over England and Okada in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0037237 ("Abgrall").

In response, it is respectfully argued that the combination of England and Okada is improper. The examiner argues that the motivation to apply Okada to England is to provide a processor with a function to prevent the illegal execution of a program, which is an object of Okada (see column 3, lines 34 to 38). This object, therefore, is allegedly fulfilled by the disclosure of Okada. Therefore, the authentication operation of Okada is to limit the right to use a specific software program to a single processor (i.e., to authenticate the processor). In contrast, England has an entirely different object, which is to hide the execution of curtained code from the normal operation of a system (see column 3, lines 36-44), and the authentication operation of England is to authenticate programs (see column 3, lines 60-64). Combining Okada and England would do nothing to help Okada prevent the illegal execution of a program or to help England hide the execution of curtained code from the normal operation of a system. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine Okada and England.

More specifically, the examiner argues that England describes loading an authenticated code module into memory and locking the memory. Locking the memory, according to England, is disabling all accesses to memory apart from those initiated by the processor executing authorized code (see column 11, lines 40-43). There would be no reason to do this in connection with preventing the illegal execution of a program by a processor. The program would be accessible for execution by the processor, legally or illegally. England is clearly not related to preventing the illegal execution of a program.

Therefore, the combination of Okada and England is improper and withdrawal of the rejections based on their combination is respectfully requested.

2

42390P13736

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the rejections of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12-18, 22, and 23 have been overcome, and that claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12-18, 22, and 23 are in condition for allowance. The applicant therefore respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please charge any necessary fees, including extension fees, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 29, 2008

Thomas R. Lane
Registration No. 42,781

3